

REMARKS

The Office action dated September 25, 2006, and the references cited therein have been received and carefully reviewed.

As a preliminary matter, the Office action was discussed between the undersigned, the Examiner, and the Examiner's Supervisor during a personal interview on March 6, 2007, for which, the undersigned would like to thank the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor for taking the time to discuss the Office action and for their helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office action, claims 1 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Heil. Claims 2-4 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heil in view of Maenke. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heil in view of Maenke, and further in view of Gouttefangeas. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heil in view of Maenke and in view of Gouttefangeas, and further in view of Hagen. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heil in view of Hagen. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heil in view of Gouttefangeas. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heil in view of Gouttefangeas and

further in view of Hagen. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heil in view of Gouttefangeas and further in view of Daenen. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heil in view of Daenen. And, claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heil in view of Daenen and further in view of Maenke. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicants' invention as now claimed in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

As discussed and agreed during the personal interview, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 2 and 3, and claims 2 and 3 have been canceled without prejudice of disclaimer. Also, claim 17 has been amended to include similar limitations as recited in original claims 2 and 3 in order to distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. As agreed, Heil fails to disclose and teach "said vent panel is perforated with multiple holes over substantially the full extent of said panel to define a venting area, said venting area being coextensive with a substantial area of said cover, a foil of predetermined vapor permeability fixed to said panel in overlying relation to and

coextensive with said venting area for a venting of vapors from said chamber to the ambient" as now required by claims 1 and 17. None of the cited prior art references, taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests these limitations or addresses the shortcomings of the Heil reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 17 are now allowable over the prior art. Claims 4-16 and 18-19 are dependent from claims 1 and 17, respectively, and are therefore believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claims 1 and 17.

Each issue raised in the Office action dated September 25, 2007, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1 and 4-19 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ &
MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16

Date: 3/26/07